

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RONALD SALLEE,

Defendant and Appellant.

B265700

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. LA039726)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Alan K. Schneider, Judge. Affirmed.

Andrian K. Panton, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In 2002 a jury convicted defendant Ronald Sallee of first degree robbery and first degree residential burglary, with findings that the victim was 65 years of age or older and findings of three prior serious felony convictions. Defendant was sentenced to a third strike term of 25 years to life, plus 5 years for each of the three prior serious felony convictions (Pen. Code, § 667, subd. (a)(1)¹), plus a 1-year enhancement based upon the victim's age, for an aggregate term of 41 years to life.

Defendant subsequently filed a habeas corpus petition in this court challenging the imposition of three section 667, subdivision (a)(1) enhancements on the ground that the three prior convictions supporting these enhancements all stemmed from a single prosecution, and were thus not brought and tried separately. This court granted the petition on January 15, 2015, and directed the trial court to resentence defendant. (*In re Sallee*, B258633.) On May 12, 2015, the trial court did so. In accordance with this court's order, the trial court imposed only one of the three section 667, subdivision (a)(1) enhancements, for an aggregate term of 31 years to life.

Defendant filed a timely appeal. We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. On March 22, 2016, we advised defendant he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

¹ Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

LUI, J.

We concur:

CHANEY, Acting P. J.

JOHNSON, J.